



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/726,269	11/30/2000	Rabindranath Dutta	AUS920000774US1	5231

7590

04/25/2003

Kelly K. Kordzik  
Suite 800  
100 Congress Avenue  
Austin, TX 78701

EXAMINER

CHUONG, TRUC T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 04/25/2003

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/726,269

Applicant(s)

DUTTA, RABINDRANATH

Examiner

Truc T Chuong

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-17, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Klimczak et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,513,111 B2).

As to claim 1, Klimczak teaches a method for displaying information on a data processing system, comprising the steps of:

creating a content object (application, Abstract and col. 1 lines 53);

creating control GUI objects (action item, col. 1 lines 40-56);

determining if an input has been received to display the content object without displaying the control GUI objects (action items relating to aspects of each user's access, col. 1 lines 44-45); and

Klimczak inherently shows displaying the content object without displaying the control GUI objects if the input has been received because Klimczak's software application defines action items relating to aspects of each user's access (col. 1 lines 44-45 and col. 2 lines 22-31, and user are allowed accesses to aspects of the user interface on

Art Unit: 2174

an individualized basis, col. 1 lines 46-50); therefore, a subscriber can give its user access to more or fewer user interface features depending upon individual needs (Abstract).

As to claim 2, Klimczak teaches the method as recited in claim 1, further comprising the step of displaying the content object and the control GUI objects if an input has been received to display the content object with the control GUI objects (application display, col. 3 lines 7-11).

As to claim 3, Klimczak inherently shows the method as recited in claim 1 wherein the content object and the control GUI objects are created by an application program running in the data processing system, and wherein the content object contains no control GUI objects because Klimczak's system has the ability to setup permission for each user (col. 1 lines 60-63) so that the user is given certain "action items" to use or none of all.

As to claim 4, Klimczak teaches in a data processing system, a method comprising the steps of:

in an application program, determining control GUI objects and a content object (software application, col. 1 lines 44-50);

determining if a user has set a display option flag (Action ID of figs. 7-8, enable or disable for each user, col. 6 lines 35-39) indicating a preference for either a conventional screen object to be displayed comprising a display of the control GUI objects and the content object or an unconventional screen object to be displayed comprising a display of the content object but not any of the control GUI objects (set up the software, col. 3 lines 23); and

determining the screen object to include the content object but not any of the control GUI objects as a function of the display option flag having a setting indicating a

Art Unit: 2174

user preference for display of the content object without any of the control GUI objects (see claim 3 above).

As to claim 5, Klimczak teaches the method as recited in claim 4, further comprising the step of displaying the screen object on a display device of the data processing system (Display, col. 3 lines 42-44).

As to claim 6, this is a combination of claims 4 and 5. Note the rejections of claims 4 and 5 above.

As to claim 9, this is a computer program product claim of system claim 4. Note the rejection of claim 4 above.

As to claim 10, this is similar in scope to claim 9 above except the option flag can be reset. Klimczak shows reset in form of "set with Action Default Value" (col. 5 lines 55-59).

As to claim 13, Klimczak teaches data processing system comprising:

- a processor, a display coupled to the processor (Computer System, col. 3 line 37);

- a memory storing an application program (RAM, col. 3 lines 51-57) further comprising:

- a screen object that is then displayed on the display, a content object, a control GUI object (see claim 1 above);

- a display option flag (see claim 4 above); and

- a screen state changing program (display colors, col. 1 lines 62-67 and figs. 7-8) for determining whether the screen object will include only the content object without any control GUI object as a function of the display option flag (see claim 4 above).

As to claims 14 and 15, they are similar in scope to claim 4 above; therefore, rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 16, Klimczak teaches the system as recited in claim 15, wherein when the display option flag is reset for a preference that a conventional screen be displayed on the display whereby the content and the control GUIs are displayed, then the screen state changing program will determine that the screen object will include the content object and the control GUI object, any of the control object displaced by the control GUI object will be stored (see claim 4 above) into an excess content object (Klimczak indirectly shows that GUI object can be stored into an excess content object because Klimczak's physical mediums for storing information are in many different forms throughout the network (col. 2 lines 4-10, col. 3 lines 66-67 and col. 4 lines 1-11).

As to claims 7 and 11, they are similar in scope to claim 16 above; therefore, rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 17, Klimczak teaches the system as recited in claim 16 wherein the display option flag is reset for the preference that the conventional screen be displayed by receipt of a user selection of a hardware button on the system (configure a button, col. 12 lines 20-29).

As to claim 8, Klimczak inherently teaches the method as recited in claim 7 wherein if the display option flag is set to indicate a preference for the unconventional screen object then the control GUI objects are eliminated from the screen object and the excess content object is included in the screen object because Klimczak's Configuration Stage is used to set action values for each user for each action item (col. 6 lines 24-26); interface is provided to import the action information generated by each of the modules (col. 6 lines 28-29), and it is enough to utilize

Art Unit: 2174

control of application display colors as well as other action items in a constructive manner (col. 6 lines 38-42).

As to claim 12, this is a program product claim of method claim 8. Note the rejection of claim 8 above.

As to claim 21, Klimczak teaches the system as recited in claim 14, wherein the data processing system is a desktop computer (workstation, col. 3 line 32).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 18, 19, 20, and 22, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klimczak et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,513,111 B2) in view of Ditzik (U.S. Patent No. 6,064,373).

As to claim 19, Klimczak teaches the system as recited in claim 14 but does not show the data processing system is a PDA. Ditzik clearly teaches on his system using PDA, several pocket computers, and hand held tablet computers (col. 6 line 67 and col. 7 lines 1-2). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention, a person with ordinary skill in the art would use PDA or other hand held devices in Klimczak's application to provide a portable mobile display-tablet operation to the user (col. 7 lines 37-38).

Art Unit: 2174

As to claim 18, because of the capability of using PDA and other hand held devices, claim 18 can be rejected under similar rationale to claim 19 above.

As to claims 20 and 22, they are similar in scope to claim 19 above; therefore, rejected under similar rationale.

### *Conclusion*

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Arcuri et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,232,972) teach control toolbar, display size, and GUI (cols. 2-14 and figs. 1-5).

Berger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,414,693 B1) teach customizing display, profile, toolbar, and icons (cols. 2-8 and figs. 2-9).

Kerr (U.S. Patent No. 5,115,501) teaches customized user interface, appropriate icons, menu, application bars or different users, and flags (cols. 2-6 and figs. 2A-B).

Kikinis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,522,089) teach PDAs, laptop computers, and wireless communication (cols. 2-25 and figs. 1, 8, 18, 21-22).

Straub et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,905,492) teach user profile, certain information for each user, modify icons and tools, and customized (cols. 1-15 and figs. 2-7).

Mandeberg et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,038,545) teach profile, internet, advertisement, and customized (cols. 1-15 and figs. 1-5).



Art Unit: 2174

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Truc T Chuong whose telephone number is 703-305-5753. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Truc T. Chuong  
April 21, 2003

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100